UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Washington—On War and Peace

- - - - - - *Edwin D. Mead*

In Nervous Scandinavia

- - - - *Synnove Larsen Baasch*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXVI NUMBER 12

Chicago, February 17, 1936

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIALS—

Notes 223
Jottings—J. H. H. 225

ARTICLES—

"What a Piece of Work Is Man!"—HANS ZINSSER 223
Washington—On War and Peace—EDWIN D. MEAD 226
In Nervous Scandinavia—SYNNOVE LARSEN BAASCH 228
A Peace Platform—CURTIS W. REESE 230
Present Trend of British Foreign Policy—TARAKNATH DAS 231
Travel Letters—II—Honolulu and Beyond—ALSON H. ROBINSON 233
On Strike in Indiana—*Anonymous* 234

POETRY—

Beauty's Eternal Surge—ELIOT WHITE 227
To Reinhold Niebuhr—KENNETH PORTER 232
Understanding Heart—FREDA HAMMERS 235

THE STUDY TABLE—

Faith and Knowledge—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 236
Plenty for the People—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 236
A Great American Poet—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 237

CORRESPONDENCE—

To May Johnson—OLIVE COLE SMITH 238
Youth Appraises Unity—GEORGE W. WELCH 238
Dealing with International Lawbreakers—W. P. CALKINS 238
Toward Self-Support—F. S. KINDER 239

THE FIELD—

Tolstoy—from the Grave—Rebukes Mussolini—*Zion's Herald* 222
A Statement on Civil and Religious Liberties—*American Unitarian Association* 240

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Tolstoy—from the Grave—Rebukes Mussolini

Like a voice from the dead, Leo Tolstoy, in a letter hitherto unpublished but recently released by the Tolstoy Museum in Moscow, pointedly rebukes Italian Fascism for its attack against the people of Ethiopia. One of the most extraordinary parallels in history is revealed by the document, which was originally addressed to the Italian public after the crushing defeat of the Italian armed forces at Adowa on March 1, 1896, when General Baratieri's army was almost annihilated by the troops of Emperor Menelik. The letter was a hasty draft, unfinished and never published, but now, after forty years, it again has a startling pertinence.

"When will the people finally waken from the hypnosis to which irresponsible adventurers in power reduce them?" inquires Tolstoy. "Will it ever be possible for these people to draw the conclusions that are natural and clear to all who are not befogged by the superstition of patriotism? Cannot they understand for themselves that so long as they do not definitely refuse to pay that portion of the taxes that goes to armaments and the maintenance of armies, that so long as they do not protest against all military service, just so long will wars be unavoidable, and that they will be rushing on, self-impelled, toward their own destruction? Armaments keep people in poverty, and poverty increases as armaments increase. As long as the people contribute to armaments, war cannot be done away with, and, whether they win or lose, the result will be the same: countless dead and mutilated and general economic ruin.

"Can we not look for something better in the future than that some future new Crispi, some new Baratieri, should again defraud the people of their poor pennies, darken the minds of youth and send them again to their destruction in Abyssina or even more terrible—into fratricidal conflict with Frenchmen, Germans, Englishmen, Russians?"

Tolstoy discusses further in the letter the various deceptions used as pretexts for driving people into war: religious and patriotic pleas, along with others, ending with

"The saddest of all deceptions, the self-deception that resorts to all sorts of remote measures against what admits to be unjust, meaningless, and terrible, instead of the simplest and only means of combating the evil: the refusal to have anything to do with war."

The letter ends as follows:

"The day will come when the people, weary of all the meaningless misery and bloodshed, will say to their leaders: 'Go from us; put on the bloody uniforms yourselves and kill your own kind;

(*Continued on Page* 240)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXVI MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1936 No. 12

"WHAT A PIECE OF WORK IS MAN!"
—William Shakespeare.

Man and the rat are, so far, the most successful animals of prey. They are utterly destructive of other forms of life. Unlike plants, bacteria, insects, birds, neither of them is of the slightest use to any other species of living things. Gradually these two have spread across the earth, keeping pace with each other and unable to destroy each other, though continually hostile. Man and the rat will always be pitted against each other as implacable enemies. And the rat's most potent weapons against mankind have been its perpetual maintenance of the infectious agents of plague and of typhus fever.

Hans Zinsser, M. D.,
in *Rats, Lice and History.*

KAGAWA, THE SAINT OF JAPAN

The visit of Toyohiko Kagawa to this country is an occasion of notable significance and impressiveness. His speech may be disappointing, through his poor command of spoken English, but the presence of the man is enough. His humble figure, his shining face, his fervent spirit tell the story of such a life as has not been lived in Christendom since the days of St. Francis of Assisi. What is amazing, perhaps, is that Kagawa had to travel all these thousands of miles to these shores to remind us of what Christianity really is. A convert to the Gospel, this Oriental seems to know far better than ourselves, for all our nineteen hundred years of precept and practice, the meaning of the Gospel. His mien shows no resemblance to that of our ecclesiastics. His writings reveal no interest in dogma or creed. As simply and fully as the Master himself, he has found that love is the law of life. But Kagawa is no mere mystic or pietist, least of all a sentimentalist. His faith is a fighting faith, his Christianity a command to become a militant reformer of society. No question in his mind, in other words, as to the social implications of the Gospel! His organization of the workers of Japan, which carried him to prison in the great shipping strike in Kobe, is one of the outstanding labor achievements of modern times. His establishment of cooperative societies, which have enrolled forty per cent of the farmers and workers of the kingdom, is perhaps his greatest single achievement, as it is his one deepest enthusiasm. His work for peace has made him the one man most feared by the militarists of Japan. The world will not soon forget his public act of penitence for his country amid the ruins of Shanghai. Like Gandhi, his one spiritual compeer, Kagawa knows that love is all. Nonresistants both of them, these two saints realize that before the passion of the heart for brotherhood the weapons of the world are useless. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord!" In these men the Eternal lives again.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS FALTERS

The League of Nations has ended its campaign against Italy. At the very time when it should be pressing its advantage, it is holding up on sanctions and showing every indication of letting events take their course. It is said that the reason why the League is faltering, when it has so wonderful an opportunity to vindicate its cause, is that Italy's war in Ethiopia is going badly—as it most certainly is!—and that Mussolini must soon make peace of his own accord, without an oil embargo or any other intervention from Geneva. But this misses the essential point, as Sir Gilbert Murray so admirably pointed out in his much-quoted letter to the London *Times.* The League's purpose, in imposing and pressing sanctions upon Italy, was not so much to end this war as to end *all* wars. It was to show that no nation can violate its pledges, force an aggressive war upon the world, and get away with it. As things are now, with sanctions going badly, the oil embargo postponed, and the League become quiescent, Italy is going to escape condemnation and outlawry, and thus get out of her war without disaster. Indeed, the next thing that will probably happen, with or without the help of the League, is that England and France will make another peace offer to Italy at the expense of Ethiopia—the deal will be made secretly this time instead of openly, to avoid another Hoare-Laval disaster—Mussolini will snap it up without a moment's delay, and Haile Selassie will be left to pay the piper with perfectly good gifts of territory to an enemy whom he has beaten to no avail. The truth is—and this is the heart of the whole business!—the powers-that-be do not want Mussolini beaten, or humiliated, or even weakened, least of all overthrown. Geneva joins with London and Paris and even Moscow in desiring to save the Fascist regime from collapse. They shrink from the prospect of chaos in Italy, preferring the evil of Il Duce, great as it is, to other evils that they know not of. In other words, it's just the same old imperial game—each nation standing by all the others, until

the crash comes in another World War for supremacy. Anybody who can get any hope from the Ethiopian situation can extract sunshine from cucumbers. It's bad, *bad,* BAD!

"AL" SMITH SPLITS THE PARTY

The reverberation of "Al" Smith's January 25th speech at the Washington dinner of the Liberty League, like "the music" of which we are hearing so much on the radio these days, "is going 'round and around." And this is not surprising, for it was a political earthquake that "Al" let loose on that occasion. As a speech, a survey of the administration in relation to the times, we think the address was contemptible. It seemed to us to mark something like an "all-time low" in Governor Smith's career. There was actually an infantile quality in his indictment of Roosevelt as a Socialist. As a matter of fact, the President is working safely inside the capitalistic system, and the chief indictment of his policies is to be found in the fact that, from the beginning, he has been trying to do nothing more than restore this system, now so disastrously broken down, and set it going again. But the importance of the speech lies not in any intellectual or oratorical quality at all, but rather in its political significance. From this standpoint, "Al" Smith's address was one of the most important in American history. It smashed the popular hold of President Roosevelt upon the people of this country to an extent which defies all repair. It is useless for administrative spokesmen to make reply. Secretary Ickes, Senator Robinson, and the rest, are mere feathers in the wind. For "Al" has an unrivalled command of popular diction. What he says, and the way he says it, simply saturates the common mind as water saturates a sponge. As we listened to his homely, colloquial speech that fateful Saturday night, we could fairly feel voters dropping away from the administration as leaves drop from the trees in autumn. This is the most sensational political event since Theodore Roosevelt broke with Taft. Unless "Al" Smith is a hypocrite and turncoat—which he never has been!—he must desert the President in the forthcoming campaign, and in all probability oppose him actively. It sounds like the doom of the New Deal.

LEWIS SPLITS LABOR

What is happening in the labor world has a striking if superficial resemblance to what is happening in the political world. Substitute Lewis and Green for Smith and Roosevelt, and you have something of the picture! But the rival labor leaders, unlike the rival political leaders, were never friends, and they represent issues of a profound significance almost entirely absent from politics. It is these issues, unfortunately, which are quite hidden by the clash of personalities. Here a leader, Green, of the American Federation of Labor, stodgy, unimaginative, essentially conservative, but basically decent and just, is opposed by John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers, who is colorful, aggressive, of enormous vehemence and courage—and a thug of the first and worst order. In all that makes an intelligent and radical labor movement, Lewis is well-nigh as hopeless as Green. Indeed, the dominance of such a man in the labor movement of this country is evidence that American labor is still dwelling in the era of hoodlums and not of statesmen. Yet, repugnant as Lewis' leadership is, it must still be conceded that he is identified with issues which mark the greatest forward step in the labor world since the early days of Gompers. We are referring, of course, primarily to the issue of industrial unionism as over against craft unionism. Here Green is hopelessly out of date, and Lewis the real leader along the road of progress. In the same way Green is lagging hopelessly in his insistence that labor shall keep out of politics, and Lewis pushing ahead with audacious spirit is carrying the miners straight into the political field on the side of the President in the approaching campaign. All this is history in the making—and history of the right kind! So, in spite of our detestation of the man, we are all for Lewis on the issues involved in the fight. Yet, at the moment, are we most impressed by the fight itself. The tragedy of American labor hopelessly split at what is in many ways the most critical hour in labor's history! Green and Lewis together have much to account for in leadership which brings their followers into such a plight at the very moment when their enemies are hot upon them.

FREE SPEECH, THE "RED" SCARE, AND FASCISM

Is Fascism coming to this country? The *Christian Century* says "Fascism is here," and cites the Massachusetts Teachers Oath law to prove its case. Much more serious and important, to our thinking, is the "Red" scare which has been spread abroad with tireless persistency for months past by the Hearst press, which has recently been taken up with amazing ferocity by Methodist laymen, which is fostered day and night by the American Legion and other so-called patriotic societies, which breaks out periodically in Congress and constantly in acts of lawless violence and cruelty in all parts of the country. The tactics of this anti-"Red" crusade are all but standardized. At the bottom is the dead-set against Communism as a vast conspiracy against the security of the American government and the happiness of its people. The Communist, more or less identified with the devil, is an enemy, to be fought and destroyed at any cost. That Communism is organized into a political party which is entirely legal, that it carries on its propaganda by methods wholly in accordance with the law, that its leaders are mostly American-born and all of them citizens, these things are simply disregarded. *Communismo*

delenda est! The next step is to identify all liberals and radicals, all minority groups, all persons who have a few independent ideas, with Communists. A clergyman who preaches disarmament and peace, a college professor who teaches the economic causes of war, a labor leader who believes in trade unions and the right to picket, even a President (see "Al" Smith!) who presents a New Deal—these are all Communists, to be denounced and destroyed as such. The last step is the denial to all these people, by force and violence if necessary, of their constitutional rights of free speech. Everywhere throughout this country lecturers are being driven off platforms, labor leaders run out of town or beaten up, political progressives raided, suppressed, jailed without trial as in California, tortured and killed as in Florida. *Fascism is here!* Remember how Mussolini came to power in Italy and Hitler in Germany, on the tidal wave of popular fear of the "Reds," and you see exactly what is happening today in America. We sometimes wonder how much longer we are going to be able to publish UNITY.

THE BONUS HOLD-UP

Now that the Bonus bill has become a law, the full scandal of the episode is becoming apparent. A gang of highway robbers holding up a railroad train and robbing the passengers of their belongings has nothing on this crowd of lobbyists who in the name of the American Legion have just now held up Congress and made them deliver. We remember seeing a picture of the bandits in the newspapers, snapped just after the bill had passed both houses, and in the hilarity of what looked like a crowd of drunken bums was revealed the whole inner character of the event. These veterans, unlike veterans in any other country, were going to get their plunder, no matter what the cost to the government and to the general welfare—and now, thanks to the cowardice and venality of Congressmen, they've got it! The irresponsibility, the shame of the whole affair is indicated by the neglect of Congress to provide funds for the payment of the Bonus. Where is the money to be found? O, let the Executive worry about that, was the temper of these legislators who piled up a burden of more than $2,000,000,000 upon the existing debt of the United States. Bonds, of course, are a nice camouflage, but those bonds are going to be cashed, and that means *cash.* All of which shows exactly what happened—namely, a looting of the treasury. Nor is this the end, for now that the Bonus is out of the way, the fight for increased pensions has begun. And this pension business will go on, just as it did in the old G. A. R. days, bleeding the government white until the last veteran and the last widow of the last veteran have died. War is like an octopus. It fastens its long blood-sucking tentacles upon the nation, and there's no shaking them off. Do we want another war? Well, it might be a good idea to get this last war paid for, a century or two centuries hence, before we indulge in more luxury of battle.

Jottings

The talk about the bachelorhood of Edward VIII rather wearies us. England has had a Virgin Queen! Why not a Virgin King?

The second in line to England's throne is a woman—the little Princess Elizabeth. But nobody seems to worry. On the contrary! For it is an historical fact that the three greatest periods in England's history were all headed by queens—the Elizabethan Age, the Age of Queen Anne, and the Victorian Age.

Secretary of Agriculture Wallace uses careful language when he says that the mandatory refund of $200,000,000 of processing taxes as ordered by the Supreme Court is "probably the greatest legalized steal in American history." This "steal," if it is a steal, is nothing as compared with the administration's steal of over $2,000,000,000 in gold from its helpless citizens three years ago. But of course *that* steal was not "legalized," nor even legal, as the Supreme Court was careful to point out!

The Michigan *Christian Advocate,* in discussing the crime problem, says editorially: "It is hard to believe the reports true, but it is harder to understand why God does not slay the wicked by the breath of his mouth." It is evident that the editor who wrote this is an ignoramus who knows nothing of modern psychology and sociology, and a pagan who has yet to learn the first elements of Christianity. Perhaps this is what's the matter with the church!

The Bible seems to be coming back into its own these days. "Al" Smith talked in his Liberty League speech about the Prodigal Son. Senator Robinson, in his reply, took as a text the famous story of Jacob and Esau. The dinner itself was described by more than one commentator as a Belshazzer's Feast. Perhaps the Scriptures are not so wholly forgotten after all!

The current issue of the *Atlantic Monthly* publishes three slashing attacks on the administration—an article by Oswald Garrison Villard on its military policy; another by Lawrence Sullivan on "Our New Spoils System," and a third by James E. Boyle on "The AAA: An Epitaph." The brain-trusters in Washington are apparently losing the intellectuals as well as the common people!

J. H. H.

Washington—On War And Peace*

EDWIN D. MEAD

Washington, Jefferson and Franklin were the preeminent statesmen of their age—prophets and precursors of the cause of an organized and warless world, which has become the commanding cause of our own time. Independence for the sake of independence, a new nation for the sake of a new nation—that was not enough for our great fathers. They had a higher aim and motive. Their dream was of a nation in which righteousness should dwell and which should mark the beginning of a new era among men. It should be especially an era of peace and brotherhood among nations. They hated fighting. They believed that the time had come when the bloody dispensation of war, with its appalling wickedness and waste, should cease; and their high hope was that their recent republic might lead in the new dispensation of peace, order and cooperation. It is peculiarly imperative at this time to give attention to the abhorrence of war as a controlling sentiment with the men who achieved our independence; and no eloquence can be so powerful and persuasive as the simple presentation of their words.

The words of Washington himself concern us foremost. His is the strong, constructive thought. He unites the common sense of Franklin and the vision of Jefferson. "Cultivate peace and harmony with all nations" was one of the charges of his Farewell Address; and his cautions against those policies and entanglements which so naturally lead to war are known, or ought to be, by every American. His admonition to keep ourselves always in a "respectable defensive posture," when strained, as it so often is by our militant folk to cover their schemes, is wantonly misused. He knew, as well as John Bright knew a century later, how happy is our position and how impregnable we are as long as we act like Christians; and the measure of his idea of a "respectable defensive posture" is the fact that the total expenditure for national armaments under his sanction during the entire eight years of his administration was less than eight million dollars.

It is a startling fact that since Washington's time, while our area has increased five times and our population thirty times, our annual expenditure for war has increased nearly one thousand times, this expenditure being now greater than that of any other nation, despite the fact that no nation has ever declared war against us. We are the safest and strongest of nations, the least exposed to danger, and the most able to lead in assuming the risks of peace, which are so much less than the risks of war. Chief Justice Hughes well said that "in no other power or any combination of powers lies any menace to our security." In the half dozen years at the close of the last and the beginning of the present century we spent in direful and needless war eight hundred million dollars, and we have since been multiplying battleships by the dozen (surely not needed for "respectable defense") a single one of which costs vastly more than our whole army and navy appropriations during Washington's long term as President. In the Farewell Address itself, Washington denounced great armaments and spoke with deepest feeling of their dangers to democracy. "Overgrown military establishments are, under any form of government, inauspicious to liberty, and are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty."

[*In token of Washington's Birthday—EDITOR.]

Washington was no parochial statesman. No man in his great day saw so far west as he; today his vision would sweep around the world. Freeman wrote of him as "the Expander of England" because he first drastically and effectually taught England (and England has learned the lesson) that her empire could expand and could endure only by justice. He was much more the great expander of the Republic; and he would be the great expander of the Republic's true influence among men. He would tell the Republic today that it is no longer boy, but man, and that it must acquit itself like a man. While he was yet with us he foresaw the time when, our institutions being firmly consolidated and working with complete success, we might safely and perhaps beneficially take part in the consultations held by foreign states for the advantage of the nations. The war spirit is the subject of his constant rebuke. One of the points which he sets down to urge, among the early hints for the Farewell Address, is "that we may never unsheathe the sword except in self-defense, so long as justice and our essential rights and national respectability can be preserved without it."

The sure news of the Treaty of Peace had not reached America in 1783 before we find Washington expressing his weariness and condemnation of war. In the summer of 1783, he left the camp at Newburg on the Hudson and with a few associates went up the Mohawk Valley to the headwaters of the Susquehanna to survey the conditions of internal navigation. His letter to the Marquis de Chastellux, written on his return, is an amazing prophecy of the "rising empire" in the West which it was his ambition to help in opening. At a home where the party stopped on the journey, Governor Clinton, who was with them, remarked to the wife and mother that her sons would some day make fine soldiers, to which she answered that she "hoped their country never would need their services." "I hope so, too," exclaimed Washington, "for I have seen enough of war."

To David Humphreys, secretary of the commission sent abroad to negotiate treaties of commerce, he wrote, in 1785, concerning war: "My first wish is to see this plague to mankind banished from the earth, and the sons and daughters of this world employed in more pleasing and innocent amusements than in preparing implements and exercising them for the destruction of mankind." In the same tone he wrote in the same year to the Marquis de la Rouerie, an officer just appointed to the command of a French army corps: "My first wish is (although it is against the profession of arms, and would clip the wings of some of your young soldiers who are soaring after glory) to see the whole world in peace, and the inhabitants of it as one band of brothers striving who should contribute most to the happiness of mankind." To Rochambeau, in 1786, he expressed his abhorrence of the "rage of conquest" among the nations of Europe and of the "effusion of human blood for the acquisition of a little territory." To Lafayette the same year he wrote yet more strikingly, "As the member of an infant empire, as a philanthropist by character, and as a citizen of the great republic of humanity at large, I cannot help turning my attention sometimes to this subject. . . I consider how mankind may be connected like one great family in fraternal ties."

In 1788, he wrote to the Marquis de Chastellux, while the "great personages" of the north of Europe were "making war under the infatuation of Mars": "It is time for the age of knight-errantry and mad heroism to be at an end. Your young military men, who want to reap the harvest of laurels, do not care, I suppose, how many seeds of war are sown; but for the sake of humanity it is devoutly to be wished that the manly employment of agriculture and the humanizing benefits of commerce would supersede the waste of war and the rage of conquest; that the swords might be turned into ploughshares, the spears into pruning-hooks, and, as the Scriptures express it, 'the nations learn war no more.'"

In the same year he wrote to Lafayette: "Would to God the harmony of nations were an object that lay nearest to the hearts of sovereigns, and that the incentives to peace, of which commerce and facility of understanding each other are not the most inconsiderable, might be daily increased!" And again: "There seems to be a great deal of bloody work cut out for this summer in the north of Europe. If war, want and plague are to desolate these huge armies that are assembled, who that has the feelings of a man can refrain from shedding a tear over the miserable victims of regal ambition? It is really a strange thing that there should not be room enough in the world for men to live without cutting one anothers throats." At the same time he wrote to Jefferson: "In whatever manner the nations of Europe shall endeavor to keep up their prowess in war and their balance of power in peace, it will be obviously our policy to cultivate tranquillity at home and abroad, and to extend our agriculture and commerce as far as possible." To Rochambeau he wrote the next year, 1789: "Notwithstanding it might probably, in a commercial view, be greatly to the advantage of America that a war should rage on the other side of the Atlantic, yet I shall never so far divest myself of the feelings of a man interested in the happiness of his fellowmen as to wish my country's prosperity might be built on the ruins of that of other nations."

To the merchants of Philadelphia he said in 1793: "The friends of humanity will deprecate war, wheresoever it may appear; and we have experienced enough of its evils in this country to know that it should not be wantonly or unnecessarily entered upon." In his speech to Congress just before this, in 1792, he uttered the following serious words, which it becomes his countrymen never to forget: "It would be wise, by timely provisions, to guard against those acts of our own citizens which might tend to disturb peace with other nations, and to put ourselves in a condition to give that satisfaction to foreign nations which we may sometimes have occasion to require of them. I particularly recommend to your consideration the means of preventing those aggressions by our citizens on the territory of other nations, and other infractions of the law of nations, which, furnishing just subject of complaint, might endanger our peace with them."

Washington was not only directly concerned with the supplanting of the war system by rational courses between disputing nations; he was concerned with the eradication of the causes and provocations of disputes. His own experience of the friction resulting from the navigation laws and other measures of the English government before 1775 taught him that there are no more prolific occasions of hostility than trade relations; and the situation of Europe and the world today, when tariff wars prevail more widely and are working more mischief than almost ever before, commands attention to Washington's position here, which was that of veritable free trade. He wrote with peculiar clearness and emphasis on the subject to the Marquis de Chastellux in Paris, in a letter from Mount Vernon, September 5, 1785. "My first wish," he said, "is to see the blessings of peace diffused through all countries, and among all ranks in every country, and that we consider ourselves the children of a common parent, and so disposed to acts of brotherly kindness towards one another. In that case, all restrictions of trade would vanish; we should take your wines, your fruits and surplusage of other articles, and give you in return our oils, our fish, tobacco, naval stores, etc., and in like manner we should exchange produce with other countries, to our reciprocal advantage. The Globe is large enough. Why then need we wrangle for a small part of it? If one country cannot contain us, another should open its arms to us."

It should be remembered that the protective duties imposed by Hamilton, as Washington's Secretary of the Treasury, were low duties as compared with our present schedules, and adopted on grounds quite different from those on which the high tariffs of today are based. They were not intended as representing a permanent policy, but to meet the emergency created by the measures of European governments which placed us at disadvantage and in unfair position as a new nation in the establishment of our infant industries. Neither Hamilton nor Washington viewed a system of protective tariffs as a desirable permanent system for America or for the world. By significant coincidence, Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* was published in the same year, 1776, with our Declaration of Independence. We know that Hamilton read and admired it; and there was a copy of the work in Washington's own library. It was the great pioneering and prophetic expression of the principles of unrestricted international trade which Washington himself approved and commended.

Beauty's Eternal Surge

I watched the wave roll toward Maine's granite shore
To hurl its sapphire ridge in geysered foam
Along the reef's gray ramparts. But its swell,
Though lifting ever new sea floods, retained
The same long whaleback shape that first had left
The coast of Spain or sunny southern France.
The surge itself one mighty pulse, unchanged,
But never twice the same its watery mass!

So do we watch, entranced, vast Beauty's wave
That rolls unwearied to our thirsting shores
From what far spirit lands we may not know.
Now flowers, jewels, clouds provide its flood,
Now stars, wings, lovely bodies' grace, and souls
That light the ages with white truth and love,
Yet always Beauty glows through every form.
Though petals fall and sunset splendors pale,
Though youth and all its figures exquisite
Pass from the blue aeonian ocean swell
That lifts each loveliness to joy fulfilled,
This rolls beneath new tides eternally
To leave no time or universe unblest.

ELIOT WHITE.

In Nervous Scandinavia*

SYNNOVE LARSEN BAASCH

All over Norway people follow the evening broadcast from Geneva. There is decided our fate as well as that of bigger nations. If the fate of Ethiopia, a member of the League of Nations, is a matter of bartering between stronger countries, then we shall fare no better in our turn; why then bear the expense of being a member of the League? We are disgusted, not only with Italy, but with France, England, Hungary, Switzerland, and Austria, because they do not face their pledges honestly. To our minds the Scandinavian representatives have the best sense—"as usual," we say smugly, "only the small nations are really anxious to keep the peace." We may seem smug, but still we persist in thinking we are right, and we are proud because our representatives are speaking as they do, whether the strong nations listen or not. Denmark is proud of Munch, and Norway of Koht.

But the Geneva broadcast is not the only disquieting program we hear over the radio. The news broadcasting is, somehow, of greater importance than in America, both because it is unbiased, and because we are close to the scene of trouble. Often we get a terrifyingly close picture of what other nations are thinking and doing. Every hour comes from Moscow, in German, the Call to the Comrades, followed by the singing of the Internationale. (What station in America gives out such a challenge, such a threat to the existing order? Father Coughlin? Oh no!) You can turn the dial and hear every tongue of Europe. The polyglot radio frightens me. Much as I disliked all the ugly programs in America, however angry I was when a good program was interrupted by advertising, I did not fear the radio as I do here, where it personifies, not international fellowship as I expected, but international strife. Is our widened horizon a boon? I do not know what to think. If only we dared close our senses to the currents of fear and folk-mood!

Old-fashioned, democratic citizens pace the floor and wring their hands—I have witnessed it in ten different households: "How is it possible that Mussolini has not been murdered yet?"

On the train which connects Norway with the rest of Europe, and on the boat between Copenhagen and Oslo, passengers discuss conditions in dictator-ruled lands. I have been told of such coarseness and cruelty that I cannot repeat it unless it is proved to be true, and I have no proof, only a great many stories which are summed up thus:

> Unthinkable for *us*, you know, what they go through ("they" are our fellow advocates of free speech in Fascist and Nazi lands). Mussolini proclaims a united Italy, while Switzerland is overrun by Italian fugitives. The Tyroleans are sent to the front in Ethiopia; that will make room for Latins in a German land. The unemployed are sent out; that will give them something to do, other than questioning Mussolini's regime.

But under the expression "unthinkable for *us*" lies the common fear: "When shall *we* lose our freedom? Who will take it? Russia? Germany?" No one dares believe that democracy will survive, even though many have no other ideal. Others say, "Democracy is spineless. Western Europe must stand firm, armed against the hordes from the East." Or, "A change is bound to come. Let us make the change to suit us."

Yes, changes must come; they always have. It is not natural that European countries will change, however; it is not in them to stand together for or against anything whatever. Each country will look out for itself, and the big countries will be willing to take or sacrifice a smaller country according to wind and weather and trading advantage.

"Look at the way the powers are trading colonies in Africa!" say the Scandinavians. "But how can Christian nations approve of the slave trade in Ethiopia? That is something else."

And so we know what it will be for Norway when the big clash comes between fascism and communism. Despising both, we shall have no choice between them; stronger forces will settle that. In the meantime, the country lives from day to day, trying to run its affairs as well as it can, in spite of the pressure from abroad. To this country come fugitives from Russia and from Germany—Trotzky is here—and now they are coming from farther away. Of course it is a strain on finances, but that is not all. Some fugitives have suffered so much that they consider anything fair, if only they save their hides or promote their causes. The situation has been sharpened noticeably within a few months; the strayers are increasing, and so are the precautions against them.

When I landed in Oslo on June 1, I merely showed my American passport to the Norwegian officials. No questions were asked. Nor were any asked by the Danish officials when I landed in Copenhagen on July 9. But when I returned to Oslo on August 21, there was a change: "How long do you want to stay? Where? Are you going to work here?" I am a stranger in the land where I was born and educated, and I may take no work from the citizens of the country. I had to report to the chief of police, and there I received a permit to remain as a tourist for six months.

Ahead of me in the line to go on shore was one of the largest families I have ever seen. A German mother or mother-in-law; sons and daughters, aged sixteen to forty, speaking Spanish. One of the "sons" was black; was he a Moor from Southern Spain? Most of the brothers were dark, but one was very fair. One of the daughters-in-law spoke what I took to be Russian. They were cultured people, apparently middle class, with quiet voices and bland topics of conversation. They told the passport inspector that they were tourists for three months. Maybe they were. But what a lot of tourists there are nowadays who come with their entire families at whatever season of the year that occurs to them? What a pity to be travelling for pleasure with an old, weary, seasick mother and with a baby that ought to be in bed under a doctor's care! How considerate these tourists were toward one another and toward their fellow passengers! May they find safety, whatever their convictions.

"If human beings could only regain some good will toward one another, there would be a place for everybody!" say some. "What is the matter with us? Here, on the one hand, we worry because our birth statistics are sinking, and at the same time we begrudge other people the work they manage to obtain in our country. How cautious we are, and how shortsighted!"

But is unemployment what we really fear? Hardly. Bad as it is, it is not our main reason for disliking strangers. Rather, we have discovered that world brotherhood is a problem and a theory which demands individual greatness of character in each one of us

*Report of a visit in October, 1935.

before it can become a reality. We cannot read the faces of these strangers. We can only guess, and poorly, at their history. Are they despising us, are they plotting against us? They come from countries that, according to our ideas, are governed insufferably. Have they come here to help put the foreign yoke on our shoulders?

Like most small folk, we are inclined to be smug. Were we not the people that kept out of the last war, when nearly all others lost their heads? We say, "No empires for us. No colonies. No greatness at the expense of others." Sour grapes, of course, these colonies. Just the same, we *are* doing without them; and so we think that all other countries might do without them, and be better off.

The small dogs were close to the fight, and watched the big white dogs giving one another deadly wounds; the small dogs were hurt, too, and mud and blood spattered over them. So, the Scandinavian countries have borne the pettiness, the anguish of fear, the unrest, disorder, privation, epidemics, and even hunger, which go with a war. But of war's glory and romance we have had none, and, as for the good times, what were they but high prices? May our eyes be so open that we scorn them this time, too! But it is hard to remain passive, when those who are in the fight try to drag you in. And while the white dogs are fighting, the yellow and dark dogs are looking for a chance to make away with the bone. Can we bear that?

The Scandinavian countries are visited by a new kind of tourist, the Japanese. Pleasant, courteous, eager to learn and to know, they engage people in conversation wherever they go. They speak a fair German and a poor Danish or Norwegian, but no English, a panicky woman told me. "Why? Of what importance is that?" I said; but her answer was so muddled that I am no wiser. All I know is that there are many people who put a sinister interpretation on everything. Once I attempted to explain something about the position of the negro in the United States. "It has to be that way," said one of the men in the room. "If the white race doesn't keep the others in their places, the colored races will soon swarm all over everything." I was surprised, because this particular man has never been outside Denmark; but, after all, Christians are born into an amazingly strong race prejudice, whether they are Americans or Scandinavians. What images are in their minds, I wonder, when they see the hundreds of Oriental tourists in Copenhagen! Do they say, "Welcome, travellers, to the only countries in Europe where you can travel in safety!"? Or do they begrudge them that safety?

If race prejudice and nationalism were as genuine as they are harsh, the people of the North would be well off. Then, no matter how hard they feared outsiders, they would at any rate cooperate among themselves. But there is another kind of wine in the old bottle. The label was "democratic nationalism," and the contents tasted pretty flat, sometimes; but now a demon of a yeast has got into it. People, especially young people, distrust democracy. They quote examples of mismanagement under which they suffer: It *is* annoying to be compelled to pay toward an old age pension administered by the state, when the same payments would give a better return in a private insurance company. It *is* exasperating to have a large family of small children, as does my sister in Copenhagen, and to be unable to find a maid, while at the same time the family income is taxed heavily to support the unemployed. I myself witnessed the refusal of a young man to go to work at forty kroner a week. He was getting twenty kroner a week, being unemployed, and had free lodging and reduced rates at this and that; and besides, he was just starting for a three weeks' vacation in Jutland!

Is it any wonder that those who do work, who do pay their taxes, and who do need a maid or a man to help on the farm, get infuriated and doubt the system? No one man, they say, would allow such absurdities. Their memory is short, and the circle of their mental grasp is small that they can say such a thing, but that is what they believe. They want *one* man to rule. They hunger for a visible and tangible ideal, some hero who will do their thinking for them; some hero who feels convinced, as they do, that war is bound to come, and who will compel them to fight, as their restless and frightened hearts wish to do; some hero who will take the responsibility. Faceless, liquid, adjustable democracy does not suit frightened people; its very virtue, its elasticity, become its worst fault when people refuse to feel responsible individually. Frightened people want absolute stability, a rigid frame to support their weary spines. They want a fascist, a nazi spirit to pervade the country, so that Norway may stand in line with the other western Nations at the onslaught of communism. They are frenzied because some of their own countrymen adhere to the old, seemingly so powerless, democracy, the old ideal of personal freedom and responsibility. And they hate those of their countrymen who look toward Russia for a solution of our difficulties. They wish to change the constitution so that their particular enemies, the communists, shall lose their foothold. Whenever the communists have a meeting, the fascists demand that it be broken up, on the charge that its aim is unconstitutional. Whenever the fascists have a meeting, the communists demand the same thing, on the same charge. So far, both parties have received the same answer from the premier minister, Johan Nygaardsvold, a laborite: "In this country free speech, freedom of faith, and freedom of assembly are still constitutional."

How long will freedom continue to be constitutional? If Norway becomes involved in the war which Italy has begun, there will soon be an end to free speech. The League of Nations may be lukewarm about maintaining its pact and risking a war, but still, if people dare believe in no peace, of course there can be no peace. Even a farm laborer with whom I was harvesting apples some weeks ago, said wearily: "I don't suppose there will be an end till we are all involved." And the parson whose apples we were harvesting, could add nothing brighter: "Here we have this wealth of food, and we should praise God. But how can we rejoice when we remember the frugal Ethiopians, His creatures, too, with their poor underground magazines of grain."

The trees and bushes are so full of fruit this year that people despair of selling and canning all; they give away quantities, and still there is an abundance. A collection is going on, of apples and of money, to be sent to Northern Norway, where many children have never even tasted an apple. The wild berries which abound all over the country, both north and south, are being preserved with more zeal than ever; the women remember the miserable years of 1916-18. But on other commodities, prices are going up, up, for people are storing goods against the scarcity of war. One acquaintance of mine who sells leather told of a customer buy-

ing a quantity that would last for years. When my friend expressed his surprise, the customer answered: "I am paying for it, am I not? I don't intend to get caught without, and to pay the big prices I paid in the last war."

There are, however, many who cannot pay for great quantities. They, the poor, are forced into deeper poverty by the scarcity created by the war and human greed. People in moderate circumstances tell with admiration and envy of the foresight of well-to-do people in the last war: "I don't blame them," says one. "My husband insisted on being honest, and would not let me have the money to buy great quantities. And what did we get out of it? He died of an ulcerated stomach, and two of the children got tuberculosis. And look at our daughter! She is seventeen years now, and she did not learn to walk before she was three. You ought to hear her talk about the rachitis which was so dreadfully contagious during the war."

"I *do* blame them!" cried one eagerly—and she a wealthy woman herself. "If people had not been so selfish and greedy during the war, there would have been enough for all! But what did we get—rotten, stored-up leather in our shoes, and rotten fish in a country that has enough for export; and we froze, in a country where every hillside is a forest! I lived from hand to mouth then, and I mean to do it again! Nothing shall ever drive me to such greed!"

My mother, who lost her last two sons as a result of the starvation then, says, very tiredly: "At any rate I have no boys left to lose in a war."

How utterly futile a war must seem to those who are old and facing their own death!

My young nephews and cousins meet one another here in my mother's house. Some are fascists; others sit gloomily silent while the former rant. Imagine being young, fair-minded, generous, and intelligent, and then to see no prospect but that of living beneath guns and compulsion. In this particular household the blackshirts are met with cynical contempt; I do not know why they keep coming, even though blood is thicker than water. Do they think they can convert an old woman who has seen the changes of seven decades grow more cruel and violent, the more the rulers insisted upon rigidity? Or do they actually believe that they can convert their very antagonists?

Is it true what some people claim, that Germany has a network of organizers even here? And is it not peculiar how little we have heard from that country lately, while all the others are howling about Italy's way of civilizing savages. As one lecturer at the university here put it quite recently: "Germany sits very still, like the bad boy plotting mischief." Maybe he thinks that shilly-shally France and England with her interests in Egypt are better boys!

No, it is plain that the nations cannot look to one another for help, nor to their governments for guidance. Now, as always, people have to take the consequences of their own deeds and of the deeds which they allowed others to do for them. Those who feel that human intelligence and human life are too brittle to carry that burden seek God.

This war, like all others, has its religious movement. In all the fear and distrust now, the Oxford movement is gaining ground, the more rapidly because it stresses important matters which are common to all honest Christians, without demanding a bleeding wound of severance from one's accustomed church. To many seekers this movement has been a blessing; it has strengthened and unified their spiritual life. They no longer live on their selfish intelligence but listen for guidance from God, and thus live fearlessly. Explain it how you will, as integration of personality or as obedience to God, I know at least two people who were quite ordinary before, and who now tower above the rest of us, in insight, in power to influence others, in peacefulness. To them, religion is not a plaster on a wound, but the core of their being.

The Oxford movement is spreading like fire in dry grass. It has become fashionable in Norway. There is an institution called the Oxford tea, where upper-class women gather in smartly simple and expensive gowns to exchange stories about God and His ways. In Oslo last winter there was an enormous sale of black afternoon dresses. The marvels of His inspiration are broadcast wherever the Oxford teams meet. And so, maybe we have found the one thing that can save us from war. Maybe in our fright we have found the one piece of magic that will flatter God and stop Judgment! With or without Oxford, all thorough individuals know that this will be a test, not only of armaments, cunning, and cruelty, but first and last a test of character. Now each one stands alone to endure what must be endured.

A Peace Platform

CURTIS W. REESE

1. That the freest and fullest discussion and understanding of the various points of view of the establishment of peace should be maintained and encouraged.

2. That the various peace programs and attitudes should be integrated, so far as possible, into a unified peace movement.

3. That anti-war ideas and techniques should be fostered continuously to the end that the specific causes of conflict may be reduced, eliminated or settled before war ensues.

4. That in the midst of war, the attitudes of peace and the means of settling disputes should be especially upheld and proclaimed.

5. That in an actual war situation, the issues are so complex and the entire situation so unethical that there is no right side to choose as between the combatants; and that making no choice is sometimes equally wrong.

6. That causes of conflict will arise as long as separate nations, races, and religions endure; and, consequently, that techniques for the settlement of disputes should be a major concern of peace programs.

7. That neither love nor justice, neither methods nor techniques, can avail to avoid war, without the support of a unified world order in which the patterns of action operate all but automatically to eliminate competitive motives and to promote the collective good, to enhance the appreciation of uniqueness, and to build a human race that knows no color line, no national boundaries, and no divisive religions.

8. That modern knowledge and modern means of communication have transformed into a possibility the vision long held by prophets of old of a time when people shall come from the East and West, the North and South, and sit down together in peace and amity.

Present Trend of British Foreign Policy

TARAKNATH DAS

There is every reason to believe that British foreign policy will continue to play a very important part in world politics. To be sure, it is not possible for anyone to make a prophecy on the exact developments of foreign relations of any nation, yet it is possible to discern the outstanding trends of foreign policy; and in this article I shall try to point out the trend of British foreign policy and how it may affect the world at large.

Although British Tories were never whole-heartedly in favor of the League of Nations and its policy of applying sanctions, yet the present British government has adopted the policy of utilizing the League and applying sanctions against a nation, judged aggressor, for two definite reasons: first, British internal politics demanded that the Tories should make the issue of supporting the League of Nations one of the principal issues of British Foreign Policy. A short time before the last election, in a private national vote, about twelve millions of British voters indicated that they were in favor of the League of Nations and of applying sanctions—including *military* sanctions—against the treaty-breaking and aggressor nation. The Tories decided to steal the thunder of the Laborites and Liberals on the League of Nations issue and appropriated it as their own program for the election. By doing so, the Tories championed *their real program of increase of armaments—naval, air and land*—on the ground that if Britain were to support the League of Nations' policy of applying sanctions, then she should have larger navy, airforce and land armaments; second, the Tories decided that by using the League of Nations as the so-called instrument of collective peace, British statesmen will be able to use this world diplomatic machinery in isolating that nation which may oppose British interests. The British have used the League of Nations' machinery against Italy effectively, to the extent of possibly starving the Italian people into submission to British dictation, in connection with the growing Anglo-Italian rivalry in the Mediterranean, Africa and the regions of the Red Sea. The British have decided to keep control over the League machinery, so that it may be used against such powers as may threaten British interests—such as Germany, Japan and possibly Russia.

The immediate effect of this policy of using the League of Nations to isolate a nation, opposing British interests, is to adopt a policy which will force or induce great Powers outside the League to follow British foreign policy as reflected through the League. This leads to the necessity of inducing the United States, Germany and Japan to follow a policy of supporting sanctions against Italy. Britain is at the present time less concerned about Germany and Japan supporting the sanctions of the League, because these two nations do not have enough raw materials (such as oil) in their control to effectively oppose British policy of virtual embargo on raw materials. Should the United States refuse to follow British policy of applying sanctions dictated by the League of Nations, then effectiveness of the League of Nations as an instrument of isolating a rival of Britain in world politics is much reduced. Therefore, the British authorities (official and non-official propagandists) are intent upon leading the United States to support the League of Nations. In this respect British statesmen have become signally successful, as the present administration in Washington is following British direction on the pretext of promoting world peace by applying sanctions against an aggressor nation. *It is generally recognized that some of the Washington politicians and diplomats are induced by British statesmen to believe that if the United States follows the League of Nations by virtually applying sanctions against Italy, then, in case of future necessity, the British Government would use its influence in utilizing the League machinery to apply sanctions against Japan to help the United States, provided the latter decides to follow a definite policy of curbing Japanese expansion in China.* Therefore, securing American cooperation in every possible way, without a formal Anglo-American Alliance, is the most important plank of British foreign policy. It is generally regarded that the U. S. State Department is pro-British and will help British diplomacy whenever it is possible. However, there are American statesmen who feel that American foreign policy must not be the tail-end of British diplomacy; and American public opinion is not entirely in favor of a virtual Anglo-American alliance, because of the realization that such a policy may lead to a war in Europe and Asia in which the United States might be involved.

Re-assertion of Britain as the dominating factor in Europe, through a vast program of re-armament and also by playing great powers against one another, is the next important trend in British foreign policy. I shall try to illustrate this point by mentioning recent happenings of international importance.

(1) After the World War, British authorities supported Italy as long as there was Franco-Italian rivalry in the Mediterranean and Africa; but just as soon as M. Laval and Signor Mussolini decided to come to an all-round understanding and signed a friendly pact, the British Foreign Office decided to take steps to break up this Franco-Italian understanding, because a Franco-Italian combination would interfere with British supremacy in the Mediterranean. The first step taken by the British was to threaten France with retaliation. The British, in violation of the Stressa Agreement—by which it was decided that Britain, France and Italy would follow a common policy regarding Germany—signed a naval pact with Germany, by which the latter secured British consent to build up a navy which would be able to challenge the French or Russian navy. After that the British intimated to the French that they must choose between the British and the Italians as their future allies and friends. The British made it clear that if the French wished to secure British support against Germany, then they must stand by Britain against Italy's program in Ethiopia. The French did not dare to antagonize the British and had to agree with the British program.

(2) The British are manipulating the Germans with the threat of isolating Germany completely, through the action of the League of Nations and active support of France and Russia, unless the Germans follow a policy which would be acceptable to British statesmen. It seems that German statesmen are anxious to support

British foreign policy, with the expectation that Britain would not support Russia or France against Germany.

(3) British statesmen are in a position to bring pressure upon Soviet Russia, by encouraging Japan and Germany in their anti-Soviet activities.

(4) To be sure, Britain is opposed to Japanese expansion and yet she is playing Japan against the United States as well as Russia, by extending indirect support to Japan's aspirations, provided the latter does not interfere with British imperial interests in the Far East. Whenever American-Japanese tension grows, on account of naval issues or Chinese questions, Britain tries to play the part of a meditator and secures support from both quarters to maintain her supremacy in certain parts of Asia. Growing Sino-Japanese tensions serve British interests, because the Chinese and Japanese seek British support in their policies. Japanese-Russian rivalry helps Great Britain, because such a situation prevents both Japan and Russia from making a common cause against Britain in Asia.

Regarding Britain's positive policy, it is certain that British naval, air and land armaments will be augmented to such an extent that no single power will dare to attack her interests in any part of the world; and because of this great strength, other nations would seek British support in international politics. As things stand today, Britain will try to maintain her supremacy in the Mediterranean at any cost, with French and Italian cooperation if that is possible, and even in spite of their opposition, if such should develop. If France and Italy were to oppose Britain in the Mediterranean, then Britain would use the weapon of Germany against France. Britain will change the position of her naval base from Malta to Alexandria, so that her naval power will be more secure from Italian attack, and it will tighten her control over Egypt.

If Britain succeeds in securing Franco-Italian cooperation or French cooperation in the Mediterranean (after the settlement of the Italo-Ethiopian conflict) then she will decide to encourage other powers to take steps to curb either Soviet Russia or Germany which may be regarded by British statesmen as a serious menace to British interests. It is quite possible that British Tories would first support Germany, Poland and Japan to take actions which will weaken Soviet Russia. When that is accomplished, they will try to curb Germany and Japan through the aid of the League of Nations, France and her allies against Germany, and the United States against Japan.

Eventually Japan and Great Britain would come to grips on commercial, economic and political issues concerning China and Eastern Asia. But it seems that the British are willing to give Japan plenty of rope so that she will entangle herself in such a fashion that it will lead to her strangulation. British statesmen are not actively opposing Japan in her expansionist policy in Manchuria and North China, because they have more urgent problems in Europe and the Mediterranean region to solve now. The control of the Mediterranean is the first requisite for maintaining British control over India and Egypt; and control over India is the foundation of British supremacy in Eastern Asia and the Pacific. Even the formidable Singapore naval base and Australia, without the support of India, would be powerless to cope with the growing power of Japan. Furthermore, Japanese expansionist policy in China (especially her recent North China adventure) would transform China, Russia and the United States into determined foes of Japan. If Japan refuses to curb her ambitions in Asia and continues to challenge British supremacy in Eastern Asia, then Britain, after setting her European house in order, will use the League of Nations, the United States, China as well as Soviet Russia, and the tremendous power of India against Japan. In such an eventuality, Japan will be faced with the combined Anglo-American fleet, Russian land-power and air forces, Chinese forces supported by Indian forces which might march through South China or Tibet towards Japanese-controlled North China. In a future Anglo-Japanese conflict, India will play the part of a deciding factor as was the case in the World War.

Eventual conflict between Japan and Great Britain, supported by the United States, Russia, China and other powers, is not inevitable. This may be avoided, if British Tories and Japanese statesmen agree to come to an understanding and revive the old Anglo-Japanese Alliance. In fact, British Tories will be forced to come to an understanding with Japan—on Japan's terms—if Britain should be faced with a powerful hostile combination of powers in Europe and effective revolts in Egypt and India and she (Britain) does not find wholehearted cooperation from the United States.

In short, re-assertion of Britain as the most dominant power in the world will be the trend of future British foreign policy. To assert this policy, Britain will try to maintain and augment her strangle-hold in Egypt and India and use resources, man-power and strategic position of these countries to the fullest extent, even by making some minor concessions to the nationalists of these countries. So long as great powers of Europe continue to be hostile to each other and play into Britain's hands, so long as Britain can utilize Egypt, India and other Asian peoples to further her ends, and so long as Britain has nothing to fear from the United States, there is no reason to think that the ambition of British statesmen will be thwarted by any local opposition or any opposition from a single power.

The future peace of the world largely depends upon British foreign policy. British statesmen will not willingly give up their country's dominant position when challenged by any power. British statesmen want peace on the basis of *status quo,* maintaining the present British Empire and upholding British dominance in world politics. They will not hesitate to mobilize the immense power of the British Empire and enlist support of other nations to crush Britain's rivals. This has been the history of Britain's foreign policy. But there is no possibility of world peace on the basis of status quo. Unless rivalry between Great Powers ceases and they agree to allow other nations—weak and subjugated ones such as India and Egypt—to enjoy equal freedom, there will be international conflicts in which Great Britain with her far-flung empire will be directly and indirectly involved. In such future conflicts of Britain, Egypt, India and other subjugated Asian peoples will be forced to make great sacrifices in men and wealth for the glory of the British Empire!

To Reinhold Niebuhr

Harsh and healing, words rasp and flash—
astringent sight and sound—
salt rubbed into flayed raw flesh,
needles closing a wound!

KENNETH PORTER.

Travel Letters—II
Honolulu and Beyond

ALSON H. ROBINSON

Our location, January 9, on the Pacific Ocean —Lat. 33.04 North, Long. 146-18 East—is approximately 377 miles east of Yokohama. When we left home our friends were kind enough to wish us happy landings. If they only knew! This ocean is very badly named. It ought to be called anything but Pacific. Some of our fellow travelers who have crossed it several times admit that never have they been so uncomfortable. Perhaps the ship may have something to do with it—the *President Coolidge*. Traditional calm in the midst of storm doesn't seem to carry over from personality to vessel. But there have been many compensations.

After you leave Honolulu you settle down for the long pull. Up to that point there is a sort of temporary relationship about the whole thing. Some sixty of the passengers will leave the ship at that port, and then we shall see who the survivors are. On the whole these voyagers are a different lot from those one meets on transatlantic vessels. Some are missionaries, returning from furloughs in the States. One such apostle is starting out fresh—and how fresh—to spread the glad gospel of Aimee Semple McPherson in the Philippine Islands. There are many young men representing American business firms, buyers from New York department stores. Here is another headed for Bombay as an agent for the Standard Oil Company—oil for the lamps of India. Others are involved in the sugar industry of the Philippines. There are several Chinese business men, and a Portugese princess, with the strangest sort of entourage; and best of all there are children, lots of them, who with their spontaneous activity and boundless energy provide more diversion for their slightly unsettled elders than all the movies or horse races which the second steward can supply. These persons are traveling with a purpose, and they realize for the most part that the world toward which their faces are turned proposes to greet them with friendliness, and a challenge.

In the matter of diversion, perhaps one of the most intriguing experiences has been the endless debate over the lost day. By international agreement, the 180th meridian is where the day begins. In accordance with our westward course our watches have been retarded thirty minutes every night. Obviously you can't go on doing that indefinitely. Arnold Bennett offered us clever suggestions as to how to live on twenty-four hours a day. But for the past two weeks our day on ship board has consisted of twenty-four hours and thirty minutes. It was pretty good. Some spent that extra thirty minutes at bar; others in bed; still others more profitably than in either of those places. But then something happened. Early Sunday morning we crossed the 180th meridian of longitude, and when we woke up on Monday morning we found that it wasn't Monday at all but Tuesday. To be sure it was Monday back home, but the folks there hadn't been tampering with their watches. The captain had taken an entire twenty-four hours away from us by the simple act of crossing an imaginary line. Now we start in again setting back our watches, and by the time we get to New York we shall have recovered it all.

In spite of all these strange adventures in time and space which have separated us from our friends at home, making San Francisco seem frightfully far away, and New York even more so, we are far from being cut off from the world. In fact we are probably getting more and better information through the radio news about what's going on at home than we shall have in China, Java, Siam and India for the next four months. We knew when the Lindberghs landed in England on their tragic exile; that Atlanta, Georgia had been shoveling itself through a snowstorm, while we, for a day at least, basked in sunshine; news reached us of the bombing of Red Cross hospitals by Italian planes in Ethiopia, and of President Roosevelt's address to Congress, and the decisions of the Supreme Court regarding the AAA.

Strangely enough we have got very little regarding relations between China and Japan. And we have wondered. That is a situation which concerns us very personally, because our purpose holds, after we have visited Japan, to cross to Korea, thence to Manchuria, southward into Northern and Southern China. We want to know whether we shall be able to get through. We wonder whether the silence of the radio on this point means anything to us. There have been but two references, where we had hoped for many more. On the 31st of December a dispatch from Nanking announced that China and Japan are exchanging preliminary views which, it is hoped, will lead to an accord and establish the relations of the two governments on a friendly basis. What does it mean? We wish we knew. This morning's news carries a dispatch from Rio de Janeiro stating that Harry Burger, arrested in that city as a Communist organizer, and who has lived for a long time in China, told the police that a Communist Revolution was planned for China in 1936. All of which leaves the prospective traveler in China very much in the dark. Mr. Arthur G. Robinson, returning to Tientsin, where he has lived for many years, assures us we need have no fear. So complete is the Japanese control of Manchuria and North China that our journey will be quite orderly and uneventful, but illuminating nevertheless.

Honolulu was a happy surprise. I was all wrong in my presuppositions. At least sufficiently so to have to take back a lot of things I've said. It seems strange to find these enormous mountains in the midst of the Pacific, some of them thirteen thousand feet or more above the sea level. If you were to start with them at the ocean bed you would have an altitude equalling that of Mount Everest. The entrance to the harbor at Honolulu will hardly warrant the use of superlatives. Such places seldom do; but when you find yourself in the home of

[*Second in the series of letters by Mr. Robinson, contributing editor to UNITY, who is enjoying a sabbatical year in Japan, China and India.—EDITOR.]

one of the leading lawyers of the islands, and he asks you whether you have ever seen breadfruit growing; and when he takes you into the garden amidst all sorts of tropical fruits, papayas, figs, bananas, flowering shrubs, poinsettias, you rub your eyes, recall that it is January 1, and wonder what has become of your vocabulary.

But for such understanding of these enchanted isles as a brief visit may afford we are indebted to Dr. Arthur Wakefield Slaten. Dr. Slaten was formerly a Unitarian minister in New York, now a member of the editorial staff of the Honolulu *Star Bulletin.* And it was under the intelligent and discriminating guidance of Dr. and Mrs. Slaten that our tour was made. Splendid modern public buildings, wide clean streets, bathing beaches and hotels that have proved irresistible to those able to pay the price of this playground of the Pacific. But time was getting short and we must see the sugar cane. This and the pineapple industry are the two main activities of the island. In fact there isn't anything else. The result is that merchandise is expensive, having to be brought from the mainland. The sugar plants are at various stages of growth at all seasons of the year. Apparently it's a continuous process. When the cane is ripe, having reached a height of fifteen feet or more, fire is set to the field and thereafter the cane is cut, crushed, and the resulting fluid or crude sugar sent to the states for refining. There are no refineries on the island. The result is that the Hawaiians pay dearly for sugar.

Two or three conspicuous observations about these islands strike a person coming to them for the first time. First, the big issue here is racial. The original inhabitants were Polynesian, the same sort of people one may find on the entire chain of islands extending thousands of miles south to New Zealand. About a third of the present population are Japanese; there are many Chinese, Portugese, and the small but dominant Houlis, or whites. Purity of race under these conditions is impossible. Here they are all living together on a tiny island in the middle of the Pacific. Of course they have all come here—those who are not native—in answer to the call of sugar. The plantation owners haven't cared what happened so long as they got cheap labor. The natives were apparently a superior race, and such representatives as remain are splendid types, but like our American Indian they are fast passing.

Second, apparently this is no place for a liberal, let alone a radical. Dr. Slaten says that he enjoys his opportunity as a columnist on the paper to say a great variety of things which as a liberal he wants to express, and apparently he is doing an excellent job. But he admits that he isn't trying to reform the world as he once did in New York. Honolulu is even more difficult than the great American Metropolis. Slaten is very anxious to get to the Orient, so that he may see something first hand of the representatives of those races among whom he is living.

And, finally, I have had to submit to revision of opinion concerning the practice of hanging those wreaths around the necks of departing guests. I used to think it silly. The *New Yorker* spoiled the custom for me in its cover picture some months ago of a portly gentleman boarding ship wreathed to his ears. I was willing that Mrs. Robinson and Margery should be so decorated; but for a man it's a horse of a different color. But when, at the hands of Dr. Slaten and presently a similar investiture by Mr. Oscar Shepherd, principal of one of their famous private schools, I found myself decorated for the first time in my life, I realized that the *New Yorker* hadn't after all done its worst to me. I just couldn't bring myself to the point of throwing those wreaths in the sea. They reposed in the wash bowl for several days, and every time I scrubbed my teeth I had to do it in the tub.

The United States is not likely to give up these islands in a hurry. It's a lovely place to play, profitable at least for some, and capable of protection, as the Philippines are not. A big navy cruiser in the harbor flying the stars and stripes tells you who runs this show, and when Amelia Earhart made her spectacular flight to the mainland a few months ago, apparently it was not wholly in the interests of aviation. She is reported to have taken a sugar flight, dramatizing the hope of the plantation owners for a generous allotment.

On Strike in Indiana*

Zero winds whistled at the brick corners and bit fiercely at the soldiers' ears as they huddled over an old stove in the middle of the street. Shaking with cold, they stood guard at the gate to the plant of M. Fine & Sons, shirt manufacturers. They had come to break the strike. Mostly from workers' homes themselves they were there to help drive other workers back to starvation wages, and sweatshop stretch out. They were there to make New Albany safe for the profits of M. Fine & Sons.

We had come to get facts on the situation. Martial law had been declared January 20. Over a dozen arrests were reported. Homes were raided. Workers were not allowed to congregate. It was a complete military dictatorship in the interest of M. Fine & Sons.

The very winds seemed charged and colder. Dark settled down with a particular grouch at daylight. We tramped into one of the corner sandwich shops. "No," the proprietor said. "Don't know nothing." He glanced about with a scared look in his eyes. "Know nothing, nothing!" He turned to look toward the doorway.

It was the same attitude in the next store. Scared to speak. Afraid to breathe a whisper about the strike, about martial law in New Albany.

"Well," I said, "looks like this ain't going to get us far. Let's try a working-class looking home. Might accidentally run into a striker who would talk."

Several such houses we found had soldiers stationed at the gates. I finally found one with no soldiers and decided to try it. A fiery old lady answered my knock.

"Don't know a thing!" She said. "And what do you want to know about this strike for, anyway?" Her voice was sharp.

[*This article, anonymous for obvious reasons, is written by a well-known radical poet and reformer. It is an account of personal experience.—Editor.]

"Want to get a story for some papers. Wanted to get real facts from first hand," I explained.

"Want a story, eh! Been a lot of stories told already. What kind of paper do you write for?" Her eyes fired antagonism.

"For a labor paper," I ventured, not yet being sure how her sympathies ran.

"Come here, Ann. Come here, Mack," she called back to the kitchen. "Here's a man from a labor paper. Wants a true story of the strike." Then to me: "We're for the union. Those girls have had a dirty deal. Why, they wouldn't let my son-in-law bring his wife to see me yesterday. Punched a bayonet in his stomach and arrested him."

Mack volunteered to go with us to some homes of union members. At one place we were told, "Can't come in here. Just been raided. They watch here all the time. Go to Dad's home on ..... Street. We'll be there right behind you."

Finally we got settled down with a dozen or more workers, coming in from back and side doors. In their honest, straightforward way, they told us about the strike, martial law, wage-cuts, abuses,—starvation conditions.

Its tense times about New Albany. You'd better not walk the street with more than one friend. You'll be arrested or put off the streets. If two or three neighbors happen to drop in at your place, your home will be raided. They search for strike meetings. Some homes have guards stationed at the gates all day long. Plenty of "protection" in New Albany!

The struggle started back on November 14. Its roots grew out of deeper causes farther back. Under the NRA, M. Fine & Sons had managed to juggle figures and increase the stretch out to benefit themselves. They never came up to the code requirements. In shirt-making, girls are paid by the piece. For a bundle of so many pieces, she receives a credit ticket. Under NRA girls had to work like the devil to make enough credit tickets to make the minimum wage. If you didn't make the minimum it was just too bad. You didn't have a job any more. Many girls could not make it. So they bought credit tickets from other girls and didn't punch their time cards. It was either that or no job.

When NRA ended, M. Fine & Sons immediately cut wages and raised hours. There was no union then. The workers, the mass majority of whom are girls, saw nothing to do except bow and take it like slaves. And some of the treatment and abuse they get is little better than that received by slaves. E. G. Truex is superintendent. Like his masters, the Fines, he is unscrupulous. He is a brow-beating, abusive bully. It is common talk of how he curses, abuses, threatens, and sometimes grabs and shakes the girls who work under him. He is an ex-prison guard. He brags of how he treated the prisoners. He boasts that he has no more concern or sympathy for the girls that work under him than he had for the prisoners he used to guard with gun and club.

About the first of November, M. Fine & Sons put in the second wage-cut since NRA's death. It was a brutal slash at the very livelihood of the garment workers. It averaged about a 45 per cent wage cut plus an hour working time each day. The few men working in the plants were cut to $5.00 a week.

A little after this murderous wage-cut, the garment workers started to organize. A United Garment Workers Union organizer came in and they had a good union started. But M. Fine & Sons got the wind. They were determined to have no union in their plant. So, without any warning, they closed down. The workers found themselves fired and locked out!

That was the beginning of the now over two months-old strike which spread through the M. Fine & Sons' plant in both New Albany and Jeffersonville.

Recently the Fines have tried to open up with scab labor, mostly imported from Louisville and other places. The union was on the job. It kept a strong picket line right around the plants. Peaceful and orderly picketing was carried on every day. Folks in New Albany say there was never any disturbance, no trouble, no violence—till the troops came.

About the first thing the troops did was to cut down the relief tent, and take charge of the building rented by the union as relief headquarters and soup kitchen. All the groceries and supplies were "captured" by the troops and the strikers are not allowed to distribute them. It was the union's stove the soldiers set up in the street, and the union's coal they burn while breaking the union's strike.

This is Governor McNutt's "democratic" response to the thousands of such toilers who put him in office. And these workers are feeling it. They are beginning to see through campaign promises. They say there's no difference between the democrats and republicans when elected—both belong to the same dirty clique and serve the same big powers. Such lessons learned in the school of bitter experience come at a dear price. They will not be easily forgotten.

The troops were sent in with the definite purpose of breaking this militant struggle. They were to help the Fines start up their plants with scab labor, or drive hundreds of workers back to jobs which mean further poverty and want. But so far they have been able to get only some sixty-four scabs back into the New Albany plant which employs from nine hundred to a thousand regularly. Fine wants to force them back with the huge wage-cut, open shop and forty-eight hours. The union holds out for forty hours, NRA wages, and closed shop.

The situation looks bad for the union right now unless something is done about the martial law. The troops prohibit distribution of relief supplies. They "captured" and hold the relief store and what supplies were on hand. And workers have to eat, even union members. Governor McNutt should be swamped with a wave of mass protests, demanding the removal of troops and restoration of constitutional right to the strikers of Clark and Floyd Counties in Indiana.

Understanding Heart

My heart was heavy with the weight of years,
For it was bowed by reason of my tears;
My people crept in shadow by the wall
Beyond the sun, which seemed to shine for all.
"Oh why are they cast down," I sadly cried,
"In segregation, where are none beside?"
A voice spoke softly from the empty space—
"You are the children of a priestly race
Who first brought knowedge of the one true God,
And ever since have felt the burning rod."
"Have all my people suffered equally?"
"Yes, even Christ, the Man of Gallilee,
A loyal Jew who preached the Godly word
So valiantly that every heart was stirred."
"And would they shun Him were He here today?"
"Doubtless they would, for that has been their way."
How vain the knowledge language can impart,
When God but asks an understanding heart.

FREDA HAMMERS.

The Study Table

Faith and Knowledge

RELIGION AND SCIENCE. *By Bertrand Russsell. 271 pp. New York: Henry Holt & Co. $2.00.*

FRONTIERS OF CHRISTIAN THINKING. *By Frederick C. Grant. 179 pp. Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co. $2.00.*

HEAD, HEART AND HANDS IN HUMAN EVOLUTION. *By R. R. Marett. 303 pp. New York: Henry Holt & Co. $3.50.*

It seems pretty late in the day to renew the old battle between religion and science, even when it can be done with such perfection of style as Bertrand Russell brings to bear in his treatise. If in all the voluminous literature on this subject there is anything to match the clarity and beauty, marred only by occasional cynicism, which characterize his pages, we do not know where it may be found. But even Mr. Russell admits that "the warfare between science and Christian theology, in spite of an occasional skirmish on the outposts, is nearly ended"; and he ventures the suggestion that "most Christians would admit that their religion is the better for it." Evidence of this is immediately at hand in the book by President Grant, of the Seabury-Western Seminary, who whole-heartedly accepts the scientific method and "what are the proved results of scientific investigation," and would get on forthwith to the main business of the church.

In his opening chapters on astronomy, biology, demonology and medicine, Mr. Russell summarizes what has been told in much greater detail by able predecessors, notably Dr. Andrew D. White, to whom all writers in this field remain permanently indebted. It is in his later chapters on psychology and philosophy, where science today is not so much recording as still seeking results, that he opens up fresh ground of immediate controversial interest. In an illuminating discussion of the soul, he declares that "the old distinction between soul and body has evaporated," and concludes that, while science cannot say anything very definite on the subject of immortality, "such arguments as are possible . . . point to the probable extinction of personality at death." Determinism he rejects as a metaphysical absolute, but on the other hand contends, in opposition to Eddington, that new discoveries about the nature of the atom have not reestablished the existence of free-will. An engrossing chapter on "mysticism" leads to the assertion that minor spiritual experience, as practiced by the mystics, "may give something of very great value" emotionally, but has no scientific validity. A scathing chapter on "cosmic purpose" shows the fiercer and more devastating side of Bertrand Russell's controversial nature. "Man, as a curious accident in a backwater," he finds "intelligible," but as "a reason which Omniscience could consider adequate as a motive for the Creator" can satisfy "only abysmal self-complacency."

In his last analysis, Mr. Russell unites religion with ethics, where it is concerned with "values." But he carefully excludes these values from the realm of truth, or knowledge, which, he says, "must be attained by scientific methods." Values thus have little value in Mr. Russell's eyes, for "what science cannot discover, mankind cannot know." It is this sole reliance upon science which stirs his great concern, in his closing pages, for freedom of inquiry which he finds threatened today by new tyrannies of the state which have taken the place of the old tyrannies of the church. "The threat to intellectual freedom," he concludes, "is greater in our day than at any time since 1660."

Of the value of values, Dr. Grant in his book expresses no doubt. On the contrary, he contends that science, while moving on its own level of experience, "has no intention of ruling out other levels." He quotes approvingly Dr. Lloyd Morgan's statement, in his Gifford Lectures, "I have led you to the church-door; but another must mount the pulpit and preach the sermon." Some such sermon Dr. Grant preaches on the spiritual ideal in Christ, the reason for the church, and the pressing problem of church unity, world fellowship, and world peace. With a less iconoclastic and far more sympathetic mind than Bertrand Russell, he finds that "Faith and Knowledge, or Religion and Science are shown to agree."

Dr. Marett's book is much more important in scientific interest and authority than can be made evident in this brief paragraph. In agreement with Dr. Grant, and in opposition to Mr. Russell, he gives large place to religion as a way of knowledge. There is the science, he says, "that attempts to vindicate a value," as well as the science "that simply deals with it as a fact." The hand in its arts and crafts, and the heart in its feelings, as well as the head in its thought, combine to disclose reality. The larger part of this volume is devoted to the evolution of religion in its various ritualistic and mystic forms in man's primitive existence. It presents an unimpeachable vindication of religion's place in the progress of humanity.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Plenty for the People

THE CHART OF PLENTY. *By Harold Loeb and Associates. New York: The Viking Press. $2.50.*

Alert-minded readers of UNITY will hail this volume as the Magna Charta of America's coming economic freedom. It is the result of the well-nigh exhaustive survey of our whole industrial and farm plant made by the National Survey of Potential Product Capacity. This organization was set up in February, 1934, by the Civil Works Administration to find out exactly what is the potential capacity of our present economic plant. This was before the findings of the Brookings Institution's more partial survey were available, and with which there is no essential disagreement in so far as the partial survey of the latter parallels the "Chart of Plenty."

One simply must see the volume to comprehend the immense labor of these sixty-odd scientists and statisticians in charting (1) the actual 1929 production; (2) the desired production; and (3) the possible production (plant capacity) of our national plant to cover all goods and services for our 126,000,000 people. The chart proves with all the precision of scientific method that the capacity of our plant to produce is such that all our people in America could live in such comfort that economic needs could be supplied to all just as freely as water or sunshine are now supplied.

Here are just two conclusions:

In the five years from 1929 to 1933 inclusive, our industrial and farm plant did not produce $287,000,000,000. (287 billion dollars) worth of goods and services that our unemployed millions and others could so easily have used. All values are given in 1929 dollars.

"Our study shows that 4370 (1929) dollars of

buying power must be given all families in order to command the full production of our existing plant." (p. 151). In other words, every family now could have every year in goods and services the equivalent of $4370 worth of such goods and services.

Of course, the book does not say how any such equitable distribution of goods and services could be attained. Probably all the readers of this review are convinced that such a distribution according to need can never be achieved so long as our plant is run for the personal profit of the owners. However, the book does suggest that we might at once start on our way out of the economic morass in which we have floundered for the past six years by simply paying labor "the most possible," instead of the "least possible." If owners and employers will get together and immediately begin thus to more equitably share purchasing power among the workers, there may be averted here in America the grave disaster that has overtaken so many European countries. Will the owners do it?

In this volume one has the proof which historians, when they come to analyze the period in which we are now living, will use to show the future day that we of 1936 ignorantly and foolishly continue to will needless poverty. We prefer to preserve a price structure rather than to place human values above financial structures, and thus continue the wickedness of poverty amidst potential plenty, a vision that even Herbert Hoover as an engineer once saw.

One word of warning! Don't use the figures of our possible production, as made clear in this volume, to help the thoughtless fall for some Fascist-minded demagogue that will promise all these possibilities without changing the present system! Such a disaster may throw us back from the possible economic freedom for all in America to the willed poverty and tyranny under which Italy and other lands now suffer.

GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE.

A Great American Poet

THE LIFE OF SIDNEY LANIER. *By Lincoln Lorenz. New York: Coward-McCann. $3.00.*

Ninety-four years ago Sidney Lanier was born in Macon, Georgia. Poet, musician, critic, novelist, university lecturer, and letter writer; as such he deserves a place in American letters. It is not for these things, however, that he will be remembered. Already a romantic saga is growing about him, the poet who battled poverty, tuberculosis, imprisonment, and baffled patriotism. Lanier will always be a fertile field for romantic biography. Lincoln Lorenz is the latest to portray the romantic side of his hero. And Lorenz has done a good piece of work. Lanier has in his life-story facts stranger than fiction.

Lanier's life may roughly be divided into four periods: 1842-1860; 1861-1865; 1865-1879; 1879-1881. In the first period the precocious Georgia lad, educated almost without benefit of public schools, exhibits all the traits of his music-loving, romantic Huguenot ancestry. At the age of seven he manufactured a flute and organized his playmates into an orchestra. He read the romances of Scott and Froissart and other books in his father's library, and entered Oglethorpe University at Midway, Georgia, in the sophomore class in 1857. Here he came under the influence of a great teacher, James Woodrow, the maternal grandfather of Woodrow Wilson. James Woodrow was a graduate of Harvard, where he was a student of Agassiz, and of Heidelberg where he drank deeply of the new German scholarship. Lanier wanted to be like Woodrow. He planned to go to Germany, to study science, literature, religion. While in Oglethorpe he read the seventeenth century writers, and received the same inspiration from that great century that has carried many another into the appreciation of the best in literature. In 1860 he was graduated, and stayed for a few months as a tutor preparing for his trip to Germany; then came the horrible reality of the Civil War.

In 1861 Lanier, buoyed up by the romantic belief in a great future for the Confederacy, showed his loyalty and patriotism by enlisting in the Macon Volunteers. The usual disillusionment came, and in 1864 he spent four wretched months in prison, caught by the North. His Coleridge, Shelley, Keats he lost in the mud, but he saved his flute and played to his fellow-prisoners. In the midst of this squalor and misery which go with romantic ideas of patriotism, he determined to be a poet. Here also the germs of tuberculosis, lurking in his half-starved body, became active.

In 1865 he found his way back to Macon, broken in body. After lying ill for some weeks, he dragged his weary body about seeking health and peace to put on paper the poems crying out to be born. During the horrors of the Period of Reconstruction, when the North showed its brutality to the wounded South, Lanier married Mary Day. Mary was to him what Sarah was to Jonathan Edwards and Beatrice to Dante. Poverty dogged the otherwise happy family. Often Mary had to part with her beloved trinkets and jewels. How Lanier loved his boys and his wife! But he was eternally hounded by germs of tuberculosis and poverty. He fled from place to place seeking to get rid of the fever that ate out his life: Texas, Florida, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina. Like Schiller and Robert Louis Stevenson he raced against time and death. In the midst of all this he kept playing his flute. Nor did he despair. His Calvinism, which Lorenz scarcely understands, added to the romance of his life. It gave purpose to life; it held him fast to the goodness of God. Only a Calvinist could have written the *Marshes of Glynn* with its unforgetable lines:

> "As the marsh-hen secretly builds on the watery sod,
> Behold I will build me a nest on the greatness of God:
> I will fly in the greatness of God as the marsh-hen flies,
> In the freedom that fills all the space 'twixt the marsh
> and the skies . . ."

At last in 1879, to the everlasting praise of President Gilman, Lanier was given a lectureship in English Literature at Johns Hopkins. The race against time and tuberculosis went on for two years. Lanier's courage never faltered. In a dramatic moment he gave Mary his great *Ballad of Trees and the Master*. *"A Ballad of Trees and the Master* was only more living expression of the ideal, active form in which nature in the guise of trees as well as man in the guise of Christ mirrored this consecrated labor." In reality the ballad is the Calvinism for which his Huguenot ancestors were exiled from France long before.

Finally the end came. His undaunted spirit left his fevered and broken body; and, as it went, it cried out,

"And I knew of the dawn by my heart, not by mine eyes."

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

To May Johnson

EDITOR OF UNITY:

From one who came to love and admire her through twenty years of association in work for those intangible things that make life worth living and give us faith in the ultimate triumph of human good over the claws and fangs, greed and lust!

We called her "Johnnie" at Lincoln Centre, because we loved her friendly interest in what any of us were trying to do and her loving, loyal devotion to Jenkin Lloyd Jones and his idealism which she found, after his death, embodied in UNITY. She was an amazingly well-read person. Many times have I sat by her at a lecture or sermon and heard her say "That idea or that quotation came from such and such a book on such and such a page." Later in her room, to my amazed ignorance, she proved it was so.

The way "Johnnie" met the last grim summons indicates her character. It was cancer, with the first operation two years ago. We did all any one can do with cancer. We hoped for the best and tried to joke the fear away. After a few weeks of absolute idleness, "Johnnie" was back at her UNITY desk, rather triumphant that it hadn't downed her yet.

The letters from the old, old UNITY friends who could no longer afford to send the price of the subscription were her greatest sorrow. Could she have afforded it, UNITY would have gone to them all, subscription paid. Many times have I found her with a smile working over the list of names dropped. When I asked her "What now?" she said, "Some money has come in to be used as needed. I am trying to decide who will miss UNITY most or need it most." I wish those old friends could know how May Johnson grieved for their loss of UNITY. Friends of UNITY were her friends. She rejoiced in any achievement of UNITY, any compliment and any of its rare good fortune.

She hoped the request of Mr. Jones' nephew might be granted that a full set of bound UNITIES might go, as a memorial to Mr. Jones, to the Wisconsin Historical Society. In that hope we join.

The ideals Jenkin Lloyd Jones bequeathed to UNITY were to her all important. She came to be Mr. Jones' secretary during the war as a loyal English sympathizer. She remained to become, under his kindly all-embracing human love, a Pacifist

Her notes of his sermons and lectures, so painstakingly recorded and preserved, are of great value to the one who will some time try to interpret Jenkin Lloyd Jones to this befuddled world.

The last summons to the operating room came the end of October. Those of us who love her appreciate her sterling qualities; those who miss, and will continue to miss her, rejoice that the steep descent into the valley was not too long or too painful. We can even imagine that if she recognized death at the end, her brave cheerful soul chuckled just a little with the greeting "I couldn't outrun you but I did get some important things finished during the last two years."

In her name, may I thank the good friends who knew her true worth and showed their appreciation. How she prized their faith and loyalty! I have known no one more appreciative of loyal friendship or more scornful of pretense.

To our comrade in work—*Farewell and hail!*

Coral Gables, Florida OLIVE COLE SMITH.

Youth Appraises Unity

Editor of UNITY:

Here are some paragraphs from a letter which I received from my sixteen-year old granddaughter of Philip, S. Dak. The letter and the selection of such a good poem as that of "Ecce Dies!" by Robert Whitaker, by a sixteen-year old pleased me exceedingly.

"The poem you find enclosed, taken from December 16th UNITY, made me think of you. I'm not sure what caused this; perhaps it was the fact that through your consideration I am able to read such gems of modern thought as appear in this periodical.

"UNITY has been invaluable to me in many ways. Not only for a current viewpoint, but as a reference. Not long ago I was able to write a very complete report on Jane Addams, for a term paper in sociology, because of the assistance I received from UNITY.

"Just why I am writing all this, aside from gratitude, I think can be explained in this way: the rigid pacifism, candid editorials, religious backing, and high idealism of UNITY, all express my own beliefs, hopes and ideals. Since you are an ardent reader of such magazines, I understand that you, too, hold these same theories."

You are at liberty to use these quotations if you like.

GEORGE W. WELCH.

San Diego, California

Dealing with International Lawbreakers

Editor of UNITY:

The January 20th issue of UNITY is excellent. I refer to the many editorials, articles and book reviews directed against the practice of war, showing the incentives back of it, the awfulness of it, the imminent danger of the outbreak of war on many fronts and, best of all, the sober and intelligent discussion of means of estopping the deadly practice.

It may interest UNITY—and the Federal Government at Washington—to learn what the Kansas farmers (I used to be one of them) think about selling supplies to warring nations. In a poll taken by the Capper publications, in which was a list of eight questions concerning their readers' attitudes toward war, was the question: Do you favor the people of the United States selling supplies to warring nations? Two thousand six hundred and eighty-two answered yes, and 70,188 answered no.

It seems to me the most feasible way to quickly overcome war—now that it is admitted by the leading nations of the world to be unjustifiable and unlawful—would be for the signatory governments to the Kellogg Briand Peace Pact, the United States Government taking the lead, to use their police forces against their own international lawbreaking citizens after the same manner as town, county and state executives use their respective police forces against all known accessory criminals.

Such policing by the various signatory governments could not rightly be called international policing. It would be only concerted police restraint of accessory war criminals; each government having self-assumed, and undisputed authority to constrain its own citizens from international law-breaking.

What if Mussolini does make good his threat of retaliation by directing his war machine against the

governments that restrain their citizens from becoming accessory criminals with him? Would not such concerted governmental action be the safest, surest, quickest way to cool his war-fever?

W. P. CALKINS.

Weed, New Mexico

Toward Self-Support

Editor of UNITY:

It may be just as well that the Federal Housing administration has not gone ahead with its work as swiftly as many had hoped. If we are to have continuously a large group of unemployed workers, any large-scale planning of new homes under government auspices should seek to provide opportunities for self-help for the stranded ones. Instead of rebuilding the slum districts with model tenement houses, we might well consider plans to provide homes on plots of ground where indigent families could raise much of the food they need.

This would call for special, but not intricate, planning. Tracts of land adjoining manufacturing centers could be secured and laid out with streets, say one thousand feet apart, and with good highways running to the city. The plan would comprise plats of say half an acre, running back some 450 feet from the street. This would place the houses close enough to each other so that they could be economically supplied with water, gas, electricity, and street car or bus service. The necessary outlay for plowing, harrowing, and for seeds should not exceed six or seven dollars. A good garden rake and hoe would suffice for tools. For working larger tracts, expensive equipment would be almost indispensable. Hence, the half-acre plat is the logical unit for the plan. A half acre capably handled should supply all the vegetables that an average-sized family would use. And some of the produce could be fed to a goat and a flock of eight or ten hens. The writer has produced most of these foodstuffs on small plats during thirty years.

Care should be taken of course to assure moderate rates for transportation to the factory and business sections. The family's expenditures for transportation should be only a little more, if any, than the majority of city families now are obliged to meet. There would be of course local schools, stores and other needed services.

When we reflect that about three-fifths of the money now expended by a city family for food are pocketed by processors and distributors, we can see how a low-income family might benefit by the plan outlined, in addition to the advantage of having a more wholesome environment for the children. The cost of half an acre five miles out from a city of 100,000 should not exceed the cost of a building lot in the congested district. Nor would the total cost of the home be greater, since certain requirements, such as brick construction, and the cost of street curbing and storm sewers, could be eliminated.

The government is now supporting a vast number of indigent families. With homes such as are here described, and with low rentals, very many of these families should become self-supporting with such work as they could secure in the city. There would be some failures. But the plan would afford the opportunity for self-help to families now without this opportunity.

F. S. KINDER.

Denver, Colorado.

Forthcoming Articles

Thomas Paine—Peace Maker—R. C. Roper
Sanctions: Are They Right or Wrong—John Haynes Holmes
Three Parables—Reginald A. Reynolds
The Dole, the Devil and the Deep Sea—May Stranathan
Harry Ward Comes to Seattle—Fred W. Shorter
A Plowman's Way of the Cross—Jay G. Sigmund

Help Our Drive for More Readers of UNITY

By securing at least one new subscriber within the next thirty days!

Use the attached form.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER BLANK

Please enter the following subscription to UNITY:

Name .....

Street and No. .....

City ..... State .....

$3.00 for a year's subscription.
($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries.)

☐ Remittance enclosed.

☐ Send invoice.

ARE YOU CONSISTENT?

Anyone who answers the following questions may have a six months free subscription to **The Arbitrator,** a monthly paper read by Harry Elmer Barnes, Harriot Stanton Blatch, Mary Ware Dennett, John Haynes Holmes, Upton Sinclair, Norman Thomas, Oswald Garrison Villard and William Allen White.

Economic and political

1—Will either the Republican or Democratic party change the basic system under which the unjust distribution of wealth and unemployment are inevitable?

2—Will you vote for some other party's candidate at each election rather than as immediate opportunism dictates?

International

3—Are methods available for settling all international disputes without war?

4—Will you refuse to support the government in the next war if it fails to adopt such specific methods?

Religious

5—Has the Christian plan of salvation as stated in the Bible been proved false?

6—If so, will you abandon Christian theology and adopt an evolutionary philosophy as a substitute for a completed revelation?

Those who prefer to remit 60 cents rather than answer these questions will receive for a year a paper whose sole propaganda is for truth.

THE ARBITRATOR
114 E. 31st St., New York City

The Field

(*Continued from Page 222*)

divide up the map as you see fit, but as for us who have maintained you with our sweat and toil, leave us in peace. It matters not to us whether we are considered a great or a small people; all that matters to us is that we should enjoy, undisturbed, the fruits of our toil, that we should peaceably exchange them for the goods of other peoples, and that all peaceful-minded people should be permitted to develop their lives in mutual harmony and understanding. This is all that we desire, and nothing more!"

—*Zion's Herald.*

A Statement on Civil and Religious Liberties*

We are living at a time when our most precious heritage, freedom, is in danger, not only abroad in such countries as Italy, Germany, and Russia, but in our own beloved country. The Congress of the United States, for the District of Columbia, and twenty states have enacted Teachers Oath Bills, which threaten to destroy freedom of teaching. A so-called Military Disaffection Bill is now before Congress, which may make it impossible to speak for peace and disarmament within several miles of a military or naval post or at meetings where any soldier or sailor may be present. Socialist and pacifist speakers and advocates of other unpopular causes, not all of them to be termed "radical" or "dangerous," have been denied hearings in many parts of the country. The denial of the rights of free speech and assembly to the lettuce workers in the Imperial Valley and to the evicted share croppers in Arkansas is widely known. Their situation differs only in degree and in the fact that it has been well publicized from that of many obscure individuals and groups in other parts of the country.

Would not such action be contrary to the spirit of the Constitution of the United States, which in the First Amendment establishes the ". . . right of freedom of speech, of the press, of assemblage and petition," and of the Constitutions of the several States?

It is in violation of our oldest Unitarian tradition, which has always been "young for liberty." Channing's paragraphs written in 1812 and 1836 respectively—which accompany this statement—are as vital today as when they were written. "The right of free discussion . . . is the most sacred and the most endangered of all our rights."

This present statement is made by the Department of Social Relations, in the belief that it is timely, to call public attention to the seriousness of the situation, and to suggest to our own churches, ministers, and laymen alike, the need for vigorous action against those whom Channing called "the worst enemies of freedom." The first duty of the true patriot is to stand with the founders of the nation for the Constitutional guaranties of "freedom of speech, of the press, and of assemblage."

Our Association has stated for years past in its public announcements that it "defends civil and religious liberty at home and abroad." We Unitarians may feel that we are acting in accordance with our noblest tradition when we take part in the fight for freedom, at the same time recognizing that he who claims the rights of freedom must also accept its responsibilities. We have ample opportunity to challenge unjust laws —as well as to defend others who do so. The opportunity may also occur for us to open our buildings for unpopular or banned causes.

The times present a challenge to those who believe that by the truth we are free; that freedom of speech, of the press, of assemblage, and of religious belief is our most valued right.

Have not our ministers and laymen, in fidelity to our tradition, an opportunity to throw the force of their influence to the utmost against the new tyranny which would "strike society with spiritual blindness and death?"

From William Ellery Channing's "Duties of the Citizen in Times of Trial or Danger"—1812

"Freedom of opinion, of speech, and of the press is our most valuable privilege, the very soul of republican institutions, the safeguard of all other rights.

"We may learn its value if we reflect that there is nothing which tyrants so much dread. They anxiously fetter the press; they scatter spies through society, that the murmurs, anguish, and indignation of their oppressed subjects may be smothered in their own breasts; that no generous sentiment may be nourished by sympathy and mutual confidence. Nothing awakes and improves men so much as free communication of thoughts and feelings. Nothing can give to public sentiment that correctness which is essential to the prosperity of a commonwealth but the free circulation of truth from the lips and pens of the wise and good.

"If such men abandon the right of free discussion; if awed by threats, they suppress their convictions; if rulers succeed in silencing every voice but that which approves them; if nothing reaches the people but what would lend support to men in power,—farewell to liberty. The form of a free government may remain; but the life, the soul, the substance is fled."

Excerpt from Letter of William Ellery Channing in re the Abolitionists—Dated at Boston, November 1, 1836.

"Of all powers, the last to be intrusted to the multitude of men, is that of determining what question shall be discussed. The greatest truths are often the most unpopular and exasperating; and were they to be denied discussion, till the many should be ready to accept them, they would never establish themselves in the general mind. The progress of society depends on nothing more than on the exposure of time-sanctioned abuses, which cannot be touched without offending multitudes, than on the promulgation of principles, which are in advance of public sentiment and practice, and which are consequently at war with the habits, prejudices, and immediate interests of large classes of the community. Of consequence, the multitude, if once allowed to dictate or proscribe subjects of discussion, would strike society with spiritual blindness, and death. The world is to be carried forward by truth, which at first offends, which wins its way by degrees, which the many hate and would rejoice to crush. The right of free discussion is therefore to be guarded by the friends of mankind, with peculiar jealousy. It is at once the most sacred, and most endangered of all our rights. He who would rob his neighbor of it, should have a mark set on him as the worst enemy of freedom."

*Presented by the Department of Social Relations of the American Unitarian Association for the use of ministers and churches.

The New Humanist

Free with each new subscription, any *one* of the following books postpaid: HUMANISM AND NEW WORLD IDEALS by Oliver L. Reiser; HUMANISM IN RELIGION EXAMINED by Robert J. Hutcheon; HUMANIST RELIGION by C. W. Reese.

Yearly $1.50 **Per Copy 25c**
Canadian and Foreign $1.75

Raymond B. Bragg, Editor
Edwin H. Wilson, Managing Editor

Published six times a year by

THE HUMANIST PRESS ASSOCIATION, Inc.
330 South Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois

LAFOLLETTE'S
Great National Weekly Newspaper
"The Progressive"
Regular price $1.50 per year
Startling facts suppressed by other papers are being exposed now. Political corruption, advertised fakes which poison and plunder the consumers, how the public is humbugged by propaganda in newspapers: these are some of the sensational revelations appearing in the next 10 issues.
Special offer 10 weeks for 20c
Open to new readers only.
Send 20 cents today for the next 10 sensational issues. The Progressive, Dept. 23 Madison, Wis.